

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 5-32 and 34-56 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 5-32 and 34-56 have been rejected. Claims 1, 21, 29 and 49 have been amended. Claims 11-20 and 39-48 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 4 and 33 have been previously canceled. No new matter has been added. Applicants submit that claims are patentable and in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and allowance of all pending claims in view of the reasons set forth below.

**I. Summary of Rejections**

In the Office Action:

claims 1-10, 29-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph;  
claims 21-28, 49-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph;  
claims 21-28, 49-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101; and  
claims 11-20 and 39-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0037417 to Meyer (hereafter “Meyer”).

These rejections are discussed below.

**II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112****A. Claims 1-10 and 29-38**

In the Office Action, claims 1-10 and 29-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner deemed that the specification does not provide support for a function library containing both the corresponding function in the second programming language and the description information.

Claims 4 and 33 have been previously canceled, thus the rejection of these claims is moot.

Claims 1 and 29 have been amended in light of the Examiner’s suggestion. Applicants believe that the amendments address the Examiner’s concerns. Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1. Claims 30-38 depend from claim 29. Dependent claims incorporate each and every element

of the independent claim upon which they depend. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the above §112 rejection of claims 1-10 and 29-38 be withdrawn.

**B. Claims 21-28 and 49-56**

In the Office Action, claims 21-28 and 49-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that there is an insufficient antecedent basis issue in the claim. Moreover, the Examiner asserts that claimed ‘function library’ is disconnected from the step of ‘translate a program file.’

Claims 21 and 49 have been amended in light of the Examiner’s suggestion. Applicants believe that the amendments address the Examiner’s concerns. Claims 22-28 depend from claim 21. Claims 50-56 depend from claim 49. Dependent claims incorporate each and every element of the independent claim upon which they depend. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the above §112 rejection of claims 21-28 and 49-56 be withdrawn.

**III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

In the Office Action, claims 21-28 and 49-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 21 and 49 have been amended in light of the Examiner’s suggestion. Applicants respectfully urge that claims 21-28 and 49-56, as amended, are directed to statutory subject matter. Claims 22-28 depend from claim 21. Claims 50-56 depend from claim 49. Dependent claims incorporate each and every element of the independent claim upon which they depend. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the above §101 rejection of claims 21-28 and 49-56 be withdrawn.

**IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In the Office Action, claims 11-20 and 39-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Meyer.

Claims 11-20 and 39-48 have been canceled. Therefore, the above §102 rejection of these claims is moot.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and comments, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance and urges the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-077RCE3. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: March 28, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Neslihan I. Doran/  
Neslihan I. Doran  
Registration No.: L0389  
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP  
One Post Office Square  
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127  
(617) 227-7400  
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)  
Attorney/Agent For Applicant